

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, October 17, 2012**
5 **6:00 p.m.**
6 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**
7 **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 300**
8 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
9

10 ***ATTENDANCE***

11
12 **Planning Commission Members:**

City Staff:

13
14 Perry Bolyard, Chair
15 Paxton Guymon
16 Lindsay Holt
17 James S. Jones
18 Jeremy D. Lapin, P.E.
19 Ed Ogilvie
20 Jennifer Shah
21 Gordon Walker
22

Brian Berndt, Community/Economic Development Dir.
Larry Gardner, Planner
Shane Topham, City Attorney
Kory Solorio, Deputy City Recorder
Mike Johnson, Planning Technician
Robyn Walton, Planning Intern

23 **BUSINESS MEETING**

24
25 **1.0 WELCOME/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS – Chair Bolyard.**

26
27 Chair Bolyard called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.
28

29 **2.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS**

30
31 There were no citizen comments.
32

33 **3.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS**

34
35 **3.1 (Project #CUP 11-010) Public Comment on a Proposal from Adam Baloch**
36 **for Site Plan Approval and Approval to Operate a Restaurant on the**
37 **Property Located at 7146 South Highland Drive.**
38

39 Catherine Burns said she had frequented Adam's Restaurant for some time and had found it to be
40 a well run business with very good long-term employees. She felt that the excellent food, great
41 service, and the restaurant's good standing with the Health Department was indicative of what
42 would transpire in a new location. Ms. Burns remarked that she would be happy to have the
43 business as a neighbor.
44

45 Commissioner Holt asked the applicant to provide a proposed timeline for completion of the
46 project. The applicant was unable to provide the requested details until the proper permits are
47 approved.

1
2 Commissioner Guymon questioned what needed to occur in order to place the matter on the
3 action item agenda. City Planner, Larry Gardner, stated that a timeframe was needed and storm
4 water issues on the site need to be addressed. He expected the matter to be ready for the next
5 meeting.

6
7 **3.2 (Project #WT 12-007) Public Comment on a Proposal from AT&T to Co-**
8 **Locate Additional Antennas on an Existing Monopole Located at 7910 South**
9 **3500 East.**

10
11 Planning Technician, Mike Johnson, presented the staff report and stated that it was their intent
12 to co-locate three new antennas on the existing monopole. He described the location of the
13 proposed pole as south of Bengal Blvd and west of 3500 East. To the north is the Brighton Point
14 Shopping Plaza and to the south are two office buildings, both of which are in the Commercial
15 Zone. Mr. Johnson stated that there is an existing 62-foot monopole. AT&T was proposing to
16 add three new 8-foot LTE antennas below the existing antennas.

17
18 AT&T Representative, Connie Miskit, explained that the plan was fairly straight forward and
19 would allow them to provide 4G coverage in the area. She also stated that this was the only site
20 in the area. The design was intended to ensure that the antennas would not stick out any further
21 than the existing antennas. It was reported that T-Mobile also co-locates on the pole.

22
23 Holly Welsh stated that she lives across the street from the tower. The neighborhood is zoned R-
24 16, which is considered low-density residential. She stated that the Smith Plaza and adjacent
25 offices are zoned Neighborhood Commercial. She understood that the pole had to be taller than
26 the current zoning but stated that the Neighborhood Commercial zoning requires a sensitive
27 transition between commercial and residential. She requested that the cell towers be placed on a
28 monopine to reduce the impact and ease the transition.

29
30 **3.3 (Project #TA 12-006) Public Comment on a Proposal Text Amendment to**
31 **Chapter 19.35 (Residential Office) Adding a Section for Regulating Signs.**

32
33 Mr. Gardner presented the text amendment and explained that the Residential Zone and Chapter
34 19.35 were anticipated to serve as transition zones between single or multi-family residential and
35 the commercial corridor. The RO Zone had many potential zones that it could exist in; however,
36 the Highland Drive Corridor was one place that the General Plan had been amended that could
37 allow potential zoning to RO, specifically from Fort Union Boulevard to I-215. Mr. Gardner
38 explained that there had been interest in development in that corridor and staff was reviewing the
39 RO ordinance with potential applicants. There were no provisions for signs, which was a
40 concern for one applicant. The ordinance was amended as a result and a new provision added for
41 signs. It was noted that the signs would be sensitive to the abutting residential zones. They
42 would be small in scale (much smaller than anything else in the commercial corridor) and would
43 not be illuminated. The signs would also be required to be compatible with the architecture of
44 the building. Mr. Gardner explained that this would allow a professional commercial use
45 adjacent to a Residential Zone while being compatible with the ordinance. Mr. Gardner
46 encouraged the Commission to review the proposed text amendments and give input.

1 Mr. Gardner asked the Commission to consider whether a monument sign would be appropriate
2 in the corridor. There was currently one monument sign in the area but it was in a Commercial
3 Regional Zone. There were currently no provisions for monument signs in the RO area. The
4 determination to be made by the Commission was whether monument signs are too commercial
5 for a zone that abuts residential neighborhoods.

6
7 City Attorney, Shane Topham, stated that the general feeling from the community was that they
8 are aware there will be signage, but do not want large or illuminated signs.

9
10 Commissioner Walker felt that monument signage could be harmful to the residential portion of
11 the neighborhood and was concerned about allowing significant signage in a residential
12 neighborhood. He expressed concern about having monument signs in the RO Zone.

13
14 Mr. Gardner stated that there was potential for some properties along Fort Union Blvd to be
15 zoned RO and felt it would be appropriate for this item to be brought to a work meeting to
16 discuss the desires of the Commission in more detail.

17
18 Chair Bolyard asked if there was evidence in the record that the signage was intentionally
19 omitted. Mr. Gardner planned to review minutes from previous meetings to in an effort to
20 answer that question. Mr. Topham could not recall whether the signage was left out on purpose
21 and thought they may have allowed placards by the front door. He also was concerned about the
22 concept of monument signs in the zone. There was discussion on height restrictions for the
23 monuments signs, which can be no higher than three feet and the fact that the ordinance is very
24 specific. It was determined that the Commission would be prepared for a work session on the
25 matter the following month.

26 27 **4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

28 29 **4.1 Discussion on Adoption of Gateway Overlay Design Guidelines.**

30
31 18:31:53) Community and Economic Development Director, Brian Berndt, stated that the Design
32 Guidelines were something that the General Plan identified as a priority for the City to establish
33 help guide and direct architectural concepts, themes, and character in the Gateway areas.
34 Specific architectural features and embellishments were identified to implement in buildings.
35 The Architectural Review Committee did not want them to be so specific that the creative license
36 of the architect is taken away. He explained that they visited certain areas and walked properties
37 with the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) to get ideas and identify themes to dress up
38 some of the properties and establish a professional architectural theme on the buildings,
39 complimenting the residential character. He stated that the Architectural Review Committee
40 recommended the guidelines document in its current form but reserved the right to make
41 additional changes.

42
43 Commissioner Guymon explained that one of the issues he would be looking for would be any
44 area in the report dealing with discussions with members of the Architecture Review Committee.
45 He felt it would be unwise for the Commission to question their knowledge and expertise in
46 those areas and wanted to see where they had the greatest concern. As a point of reference it was
47 noted that the Architectural Review Committee is made up of architects, landscape architects,

1 developers, and engineers. Mr. Berndt stated he would provide copies of previous ARC minutes
2 and to have a few ARC members present for a discussion.

3
4 Chair Bolyard asked if there were existing structures in the Gateway areas that would not
5 conform to the proposed guidelines. It was noted that the guidelines were only meant for new or
6 redeveloped properties. He wanted to see photos showing the types of products that currently
7 exist that were non-conforming with the guidelines. The possibility of scheduling a work
8 meeting was discussed.

9 10 **5.0 ACTION ITEMS**

11 12 **5.1 (Project #WT 12-007) Action on a Proposal from AT&T to Co-Locate** 13 **Additional Antennas on an Existing Monopole at 7910 South 3500 East.**

14
15 (18:40:36) Commissioner Guymon referred to comments from residents about camouflaging the
16 structure and asked if that was something that could be done. The concern was that the
17 structures with the evergreen monopine look had been erected that way intentionally. It was
18 unknown whether it would be possible to retrofit the current cell tower.

19
20 Chair Bolyard asked Mr. Berndt about a previous request approved by the Commission
21 pertaining to a monopole upgrade close to this one and if it was required to be replaced. Mr.
22 Berndt stated that that proposal was for the replacement of an existing pole and the requirement
23 was for the new pole to be camouflaged. Mr. Berndt stated that presently the City cannot require
24 existing poles to be torn down and completely rebuilt with the camouflage. It was believed to be
25 impossible at this point to retrofit existing poles to be camouflaged. Commissioner Holt noted
26 that they looked at all of the areas in the City where it would have been possible to locate the
27 towers and there were few locations to choose from.

28
29 *Commissioner Walker moved to approve the application as submitted to add the additional*
30 *antennas to the AT&T application. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.*

31
32 Commissioner Guymon commented that there was nothing in the Code that would allow them to
33 require camouflaging or anything affecting the new additions to the existing pole. Chair Bolyard
34 stated that the City was encouraging co-location to keep the numbers of poles down.

35
36 *Vote on motion: Paxton Guymon-Aye, Ed Ogilvie-Aye, Gordon Walker-Aye, James S. Jones-*
37 *Aye, Lindsay Holt-Aye, Jennifer Shah-Aye, Chair Perry Bolyard-Aye. The motion passed*
38 *unanimously. Commissioner Lapin did not participate in the vote.*

39 40 **5.2 Approval of the July 18, 2012, August 1, 2012, and September 5, 2012** 41 **Minutes.**

42
43 *Commissioner Walker moved to approve the July 18, 2012, minutes. Commissioner Guymon*
44 *seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Paxton Guymon-Aye, Ed Ogilvie-Aye, Gordon Walker-*
45 *Aye, James S. Jones-Aye, Lindsay Holt-Aye, Jennifer Shah-Abstained, Chair Perry Bolyard-*
46 *Aye. The motion passed 6-to-0 with one abstention. Commissioner Lapin did not participate*
47 *in the vote.*

1
2 *Commissioner Walker moved to approve the August 1, 2012, minutes. Commissioner Guymon*
3 *seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Paxton Guymon-Aye, Ed Ogilvie-Aye, Gordon Walker-*
4 *Aye, James S. Jones-Abstained, Lindsay Holt-Aye, Jennifer Shah-Abstained, Chair Perry*
5 *Bolyard-Aye. The motion passed unanimously 5-to-0 with two abstentions. Commissioner*
6 *Lapin did not participate in the vote.*

7
8 *Approval of the September 5, 2012 minutes was postponed to the next Planning Commission*
9 *meeting due to the fact that there were not enough required votes for approval.*

10
11 **6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

12
13 *Commissioner Shah moved to adjourn. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion. Vote on*
14 *motion: Paxton Guymon-Aye, Ed Ogilvie-Aye, Gordon Walker-Aye, James S. Jones-Aye,*
15 *Lindsay Holt-Aye, Jennifer Shah-Aye, Chair Perry Bolyard-Aye. The motion passed*
16 *unanimously. Commissioner Lapin did not participate in the vote.*

17
18 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.
19

1
2 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
3 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, October 17, 2012.*
4
5
6

7 
8
9

10 Teri Forbes
11 T Forbes Group
12 Minutes Secretary
13

14
15 Minutes approved: November 7, 2012